

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings replace the original drawing sheets for Figs. 1, 2 and 3.

**REMARKS**

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed November 1, 2005. Claims 1-6 are currently pending in the application. By means of the present amendment, Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. No new matter or issues are believed to be introduced by this amendment. In view of the amendments above and the remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

***Drawing Objection***

In the Office Action, the Drawings were objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.183(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In response, a new proposed replacement drawing sheet has been provided for Figs. 1, 2 and 3. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

***Specification Objection***

In the Office Action, the Specification was objected to for failing to include section headings. Applicants respectfully decline to add headings as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a). The Applicant has further amended the specification to provide support for the amendments to Claim 1. No new matter or issues are believed to be introduced by the amendments made to the specification.

***Claim Rejection***

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the claim does not provide sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the inner contour” in line 4 of the claim. Claim 1 has been amended in a manner which is believed to overcome the rejection.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the claims are incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. Specifically, it is not clear how the disclosed discharge lamp incorporates an ‘optical waveguide’. Claim 5 has been amended in a manner which is believed to overcome the rejection.

**35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,049,169, {“Gibson”). Independent Claim 1 has been amended to better define Applicant’s invention and to overcome the cited rejection.

Claim 1 now recites:

1. A discharge lamp with a reflector (1) and an asymmetrical burner, which reflector (1) comprises at least a reflecting surface (3) and a hollow reflector neck (4), while the asymmetrical burner is partly arranged in said hollow reflector neck (4) without making contact therewith, characterized in that the shape and the size of the inner contour (6) of the reflecting surface (3) of the reflector (1) has a substantially oval asymmetrical shape corresponding substantially to the contour of the asymmetrical burner and return pole, wherein the shape and size of an inner contour (6) of the reflecting surface is symmetrical in an x-direction and asymmetrical in a y-direction in a cross-sectional view of said hollow reflector neck (4) and orthogonal to the reflector axis (8), and in that the asymmetrical burner is centrally located in the reflector (1), the asymmetry in the y-direction for preventing rotation of the asymmetrical burner in said hollow

reflector neck and for increasing a reflective surface area of said hollow reflector neck thereby increasing the light output efficiency.

Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are deemed patentable for at least the reasons given below.

Regarding Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Gibson does not teach Applicant's discharge lamp as set forth in Claim 1.

Instead, Fig. 1 of Gibson shows a lamp having an outer envelope 20 shaped as a parabolic reflector having an integral base 21 which receives the conductive mounting legs 26, 28 there-through (see Col. 2, lines. 65-66 to Col. 3, line 1). Gibson does not disclose or suggest the above limitations which have been added to Claims 1 to differentiate Applicant's discharge lamp from the disclosure of Gibson. In particular, Gibson does not disclose or suggest at least the above-underlined limitations which have been added to Claim 1.

Accordingly, it is believed that Applicant's Claim 1 recites patentable subject matter, and therefore, withdrawal of the rejections with respect to Claim 1 and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.


Claims 2-6 depend from Claim 1 and therefore include the limitations of Claim 1. Accordingly, for the same reasons given above for Claim 1, Claims 2-6 are believed to contain patentable subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections with respect to Claims 2-6 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-6 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Frank Keegan, Esq., Intellectual Property Counsel, Philips Electronics North America, at 914-333-9669.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael A. Scaturro  
Reg. No. 51,356  
Attorney for Applicant

**Mailing Address:**  
**Intellectual Property Counsel**  
**Philips Electronics North America Corp.**  
**P.O. Box 3001**  
**345 Scarborough Road**  
**Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001**